

44. The device of claim 35, further comprising a stylus having an electrical switch electrically coupled to the microprocessor and capable of individually activating each of the plurality of electrical elements, whereby activation of the stylus switch and movement of the stylus in a proximity of the first sheet will cause each of the plurality of measures of liquid to move to a position such that light passing through said liquid measures will be refracted onto a selected colored region of the multi-colored filter array, and thereby display that color to the observer of the device.

45. The device of claim 36, wherein said device comprises an electric lamp, said device further comprising a means of dynamically changing the color of the light emitted by the lamp.

46. The device of claim 36, wherein a multi-colored light filter is not employed, and wherein the function of the liquid measures and their controlling means is only to refract the light passing through the system so as to controllably modulate the direction in which the light is emitted from the lamp.

REMARKS

Claims 1-34 are pending in this application. In this Response, claims 1-34 have been canceled without prejudice, and new claims 35-46 have been added. No new matter has been added by these new claims.

In the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner rejected (1) claims 1-3 and 14-16 as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,659,330 (Sheridon) and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,072 B1 (Comiskey); (2) claims 4, 7-9 and 12-17 under as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,757,345 (Sheridon); (3) claims 5-6 and 10-11 as being obvious over '345 Sheridan in view of Comiskey; and (4) claims 17-21 and 24-34 as being obvious over '330 Sheridan in view of Comiskey and U.S. Patent No. 6,377,249 (Mumford). Further, the Examiner has objected to informalities in the specification as well as in claim 23.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his indication that claims 22 and 23 contain allowable subject matter, although they have been objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim.

In this Response, Applicant has canceled claims 1-34, thus rendering moot all the Examiner's rejections of and objections to those claims. Applicant requests that the Examiner formally withdraw these rejections and objections. Instead, Applicant has added new claims 35-46, which Applicant believes are significantly different from the previously filed claims 1-34 and which more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicant regards as his invention. Moreover, these new claims 35-46 better define the invention over the prior art, as described below.

Applicant's patent application describes many inventions that are novel. With respect to the specific embodiment claimed, the inventions relates to liquid droplets that are induced to move, or to change their shape, and thereby creating electrowetting and electrostatic screen display systems, color displays and transmission means. For the purpose of securing early allowance of claims, Applicant has not maintained claims regarding the embodiment employing colored droplets. As such, the droplets in the claimed embodiments all share several key features, which are totally innovative and new, and are absolutely different from anything proposed in the prior art.

The claimed inventions use the controlled movement, or shape-manipulation, of liquid droplets to refract light onto selected areas of entirely separate multi-colored light filters. Thus, the droplets in Applicant's claimed device act as optical lenses. In contrast to the prior art cited by the Examiner, the droplets in Applicant's claimed device are not a media that incorporates any color or any visual indicia on or within them. For this reason, Applicant's claimed device is completely novel and quite different from anything described in the prior art.

Applicant's claimed device employs an electric field to induce the movement, or shape-change, of the droplet by employing a well-established principle of electrohydrodynamics, which shows that a liquid droplet of sufficiently small size will be attracted to the strongest electric

field adjacent to it. There is no electrical contact between the electrical potential and the droplet. Indeed, none of the prior art is even similar to this approach.

None of the cited prior art references use an electric field to cause something to move or change shape which thereby *redirects* light onto a quite separate multi-colored filter array. Applicant's claimed device thus bears no relationship at all to approaches used in the prior art (e.g., Comiskey) wherein solid particles having different colors, *change their orientation* in response to the application of an electric field and thereby display a different color to the viewer. Nor does Applicant's claimed device rely upon blocking or not blocking light from passing through the droplets. Nor do the droplets in Applicant's claimed device of themselves incorporate any color media, to act as a light filter, nor any visual color or indicia.


Applicant's specification clearly emphasizes the quite different approach taken by Applicant. For example, Figures 9A and 9B show a liquid droplet in air (thus, not using two different liquids, but rather fluids) having its shape changed by the application of an electric field which varies in strength across the area of the droplet, thereby inducing the droplet to "want to" move towards the strongest electric field, whereas the hydrophobic properties of the inner surface with which the droplet is in contact induces it to move in the *opposite* direction. Applicant has thereby achieved a very innovative means of moving the droplet to wherever desired along that plane and simultaneously allowing distortion of the *shape* of the droplet. By achieving these two functions, Applicant is able to controllably *redirect incoming light* to whatever color zone of the multi-colored filter is desired. This is absolutely different from any of the approaches described in the prior art, and none of the cited prior art either discloses or renders obvious the claimed devices.

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herewith, Applicant believes that all claims are now in condition for allowance. In the event that the Examiner determines that the application is not in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview before another Office Action is issued in the application.

A favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: 
Morey B. Wildes
Reg. No. 36,968

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC
485 Seventh Avenue, 14th Floor
New York, NY 10018
(212) 736-1940

Application of: Richard V. JESSOP
Serial No.: 09/803,445
Filed: Match 9, 2001

**VERSION OF AMENDMENTS
WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE**

IN THE SPECIFICATION:

The paragraph beginning on page 81, line 4:

If we imagine for the purposes of this example that the item described is made of rigid or flexible plastic, and that the dimensions of the multi-coloured substrate (as shown in [the drawing below] Figure 27) are less than the dimensions of the compartment containing said substrate. Preferably, there is provided in the assembly a means of facilitating the movement of the item(s) of multiple colour -bearing visual indicia – oil, or water, for example.